



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,542	10/23/2000	Pieter J. van Zee	10002477-1	1254

7590 12/23/2003
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/694,542

Applicant(s)

ZEE ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-32 follows.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 202, 204, 206 and 208. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2143

4. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454.

With respect to claim 1, Wang teaches a method of sending and validating/auditing delivery of e-media [**Wang -- Abstract**], comprising the steps of:

obtaining/receiving e-media of a sender/user wherein the sender/user has indicated a requested type of delivery of the e-media to a client/receiving party [**Wang -- Figure 7, Col. 4 lines 8-11 and Col. 6 lines 48-51 – Sender specifies type of delivery, i.e. certified e-mail delivery, and sends it to server**], wherein the client is a software application [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 41-44 – Software on mail server carries out validating/auditing of delivery**];

accessing an account of the sender/user to obtain sender/user information [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – Upon logging into server and sending message, mail server inherently and implicitly provides that software accesses storage unit to get information from sender, i.e. username, password, IP address, etc, before sending the message**];

sending the e-media to the client/receiving party [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 48-55 – User sends message which is stored on server until receiving user logs on, upon which message is sent to his local device, i.e. computer**]; and

receiving a validation/audit of the requested type of delivery upon receipt/consumption of the e-media by the client/receiving party [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 55-60 and Col. 7 lines 26-30 – Sender is notified upon delivery of message to receiver and when an action, i.e. read, forward, or delete, is performed on the message by the receiver**].

With respect to claim 2, Wang further teaches wherein the validation/audit of the requested type of delivery is attended by the client/receiving party [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 51-53 and Col. 7 lines 31-37 – Receiving party must log-in to account/server to receive which causes validation. Also, when user opens, reads, deletes or forwards the message, a notification is generated and sent to sender, which requires an attended state, i.e. user is present to perform some action on the message].**

With respect to claim 3, Wang further teaches wherein the validation/audit includes at least one of:

A biometric signatures sent by the client/receiving party; and

A user's encrypted/unencrypted Unique Identifier entered by the client/consumer/receiving party to indicate that the e-media has been received/consumed [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 51-53 – Receiving performs a log on operation to receive the certified messages from the mail server. By definition, log on means gaining access to a specific computer, a program, or a network by identifying oneself with a username and a password (Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th edition). Therefore, by logging on, receiving user enters unique username and password to receive certified mail].**

With respect to claim 6, Wang further teaches wherein the e-media is received/consumed other than by printing [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 31-35 – E-mail is received by user and consumed by reading, opening, deleting, forwarding, etc... the message].**

5. Claims 7-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454).

With respect to claim 7, Wang teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 41-44 and Col. 8 lines 41-44 -- Software, i.e. executable instructions, are stored on a disk, i.e. computer readable medium**]. The remaining limitations in the claim are similar to the limitations of the method claim of claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claims 8-9 and 12, these are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 2-3 and 6. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 8-9 and 12 are rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 13-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454).

With respect to claim 13, Wang teaches a digital content delivery service system for sending and validating/auditing delivery of e-media, comprising:

An interface e-media transfer unit, arranged to communicate with at least one of: a plurality of senders/users and other digital content delivery service system/systems [**Wang --**

Art Unit: 2143

Figure 7 (server is linked to the receiver and sender(s)) and Col. 6 lines 45-55 – Server is an intermediary point between sender account unit and receiving account unit] and coupled to a sender/user account storage unit [Wang -- Figure 3 and Col. 4 lines 46-49 - Storage device is coupled to server to store messages along with account info for sending messages] and a validation/audit processing unit, programmed to obtain/receive e-media of a sender/user wherein the sender/user has indicated a requested type of delivery of the e-media to a client/receiving party [Wang -- Figure 7, Col. 4 lines 8-11 and Col. 6 lines 48-51 – Sender specifies type of delivery, i.e. certified e-mail delivery, and sends it to server] and to store sender/user information and requested type of delivery in the sender/user account storage [Wang -- Col. 7 lines 9-11 – Certified messages, i.e. the message, sender name and address, i.e. information, is stored in account storage for future access];

The validation/audit processing unit, coupled to the interface e-media transfer unit and to the sender/user account storage unit, for obtaining sender/user information and the requested type of delivery from the sender/user account storage unit [Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – Upon logging into server and sending message, mail server inherently and implicitly provides that software accesses storage unit to get information from sender, i.e. username, password, IP address, whether the item is certified, i.e. type of delivery, etc, before sending the message], sending the e-media to the client/receiving party/other digital content delivery service system/systems [Wang -- Col. 6 lines 48-55 – User sends message which is stored in receiver/client account on server], and obtaining validation/audit information for receipt/consumption of the e-media [Wang -- Col. 6 lines 55-60 and Col. 7 lines

Art Unit: 2143

26-30 – Sender is notified upon delivery of message to receiver and when an action, i.e. read, forward, or delete, is performed on the message by the receiver]; and

The sender/user account storage unit coupled to the interface e-media transfer unit and the validation/audit processing unit, for storing sender/user information and a requested type of delivery of e-media [Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – **Each user has an account located on the server. All transactions and account information for the user are stored, i.e. sender information, including whether a message is certified or not].**

With respect to claim 14, Wang further teaches wherein at least part of the validation/audit information of the requested type of delivery is provided by the client/receiving party [Wang -- Col. 7 lines 31-37 – **Receiving account, i.e. receiving client, notifies server in order to validate/audit the message].**

With respect to claim 15, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 3. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claim 16, Wang further teaches wherein the validation/audit information of the requested type of delivery is automatically provided by a device/devices of the client/receiving party [Wang -- Col. 7 lines 26-37 – **Notifications regarding status of message and whether or not it was received are automatically sent to server and then forwarded on to the sender without the receiving user intervening].**

With respect to claim 18, Wang further teaches wherein the receipt/consumption of the e-media is achieved other than by printing [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 31-35 – Receipt/consumption can be made by simply accepting the message along with opening/reading/deleting or forwarding the message**].

7. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454).

With respect to claim 19, Wang teaches a method for performing an attended validation/audit of delivery of e-media, comprising the steps of:

Packaging, by the sender/user, the e-media and specifying the level of feedback [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 63-67 – E-mail, with/without an attachment, is composed along with or without certification request to provide validation, i.e. level of feedback**];

Requesting, by the sender/user, a delivery service to deliver the e-media [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 1-2 – Sender transmits message to ISP and mail server to be delivered**];

Accessing, by the delivery service, the sender/user account to obtain pertinent information [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – Upon logging into server and requesting to send message, mail server software inherently accesses storage unit to get information from sender account, i.e. username, password, IP address, etc, before sending the message**];

Transmitting, by the delivery service, the e-media to the client/receiving party [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 3-11 – ISP routes message to mail server of receiving client**];

Delivering of the e-media to a personal computer/device of the client/receiving party
[Wang -- Col. 7 lines 12-22 -- Message is delivered to PC of receiving party when they access their mail account to check for new messages]; and

Validating, by the client/receiving party, that the e-media has been received **[Wang -- Col. 7 lines 26-34 -- Upon accepting receipt of message, notification is sent to sender validating receipt of the message].**

With respect to claim 20, Wang further teaches wherein the step of delivering the e-media to a personal computer/device of the client/receiving party includes at least one of:

Informing the delivery service that the e-media was delivered **[Wang -- Col. 7 lines 23-24 and lines 35-37-- Receiving client validates receipt of the message and provides notification to server]; and**

Determining a desired level of delivery validation **[Wang -- Col. 7 lines 5-7 -- Mail can be certified or not certified].**

With respect to claim 21, Wang further teaches wherein the step of delivering the e-media to a personal computer/device of the client/receiving party includes at least one of:

Informing the delivery service that the e-media was delivered **[Wang -- Col. 7 lines 23-24 and lines 35-37-- Receiving client validates receipt of the message and provides notification to server]; and**

Verifying utilization by the receiving party **[Wang -- Col. 7 lines 31-37 -- Receiving party notifies server if message is opened or read or deleted or forwarded].**

With respect to claim 22, Wang further teaches wherein the step of validating, by the client/receiving party, that the e-media has been received includes one of:

Sending, by the client/receiving party, a biometric signature; and

Entering a user's encrypted/unencrypted Unique Identifier by the client/consumer/receiving party to indicate that the e-media has been utilized [Wang Col. 6 lines 51-60 – Receiving client performs a log on operation to receive the certified messages from the mail server. By definition, log on means gaining access to a specific computer, a program, or a network by identifying oneself with a username and a password (Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th edition). Therefore, by logging on, receiving user enters unique username and password to receive certified mail].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Mitsuya (JP-411312068A).

Regarding claim 4, Wang teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fails to teach wherein the validation/audit of the requested type of delivery is unattended by the client/receiving party.

Adamske, however, teaches a system upon which an unattended confirmation of an e-mail is performed by a printer upon arrival at its destination address **[Mitsuya -- Abstract -- Message is sent to receiver and printed, which validates the delivery and provides notification to the transmitter, i.e. sender]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an unattended validation/audit of a received e-mail message via a printer, as taught by Mitsuya into the invention of Wang, in order to provide verification that the message has reached the receiving individual and has printed successfully and also gaining the automated advantage of instant verification to the sender that the document has reached the receiver even if the receiver is not physically present.

Regarding claim 5, Wang-Mitsuya teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the e-media is received/consumed by printing **[Mitsuya -- Abstract Page 2 lines 3-6 -- Upon receiving message, the message is sent to print server and printed]**.

10. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454), as applied to claim 7 above, in view of Mitsuya (JP-411312068A).

Regarding claims 10-11, these are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the methods claimed in claims 4-5. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 10-11 are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454), as applied to claim 13 above, in view of Mitsuya (JP-411312068A).

Regarding claim 17, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 5. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454) in view of Mitsuya (JP-411312068A).

Regarding claim 23, Wang teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for performing validation/audit of delivery of e-media, comprising the steps of:

Packaging, by the sender/user, the e-media and specifying the level of feedback [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 63-67 – E-mail, with/without an attachment, is composed along with or without certification request to provide validation, i.e. level of feedback**]; receiving, by the delivery service, the e-media delivery request [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 1-2 – Sender transmits message to ISP and mail server to be delivered**];

Accessing, by the delivery service, the sender/user account to obtain pertinent information [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – Upon logging into server**

Art Unit: 2143

and requesting to send message, mail server software inherently accesses storage unit to get information from sender account, i.e. username, password, IP address, etc, before sending the message];

Transmitting, by the delivery service, the e-media to the client/receiving party [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 3-11 – ISP routes message to mail server of receiving client**], wherein the client is a software application [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 41-44**].

Wang, however, fails to teach an unattended validate/audit of delivery of printed e-media along with delivering and validating of the e-media by the printer of the client/receiving party.

Mitsuya teaches an unattended process wherein a printer, upon delivery of an e-mail message, validates the e-mail message after it is printed [**Mitsuya -- Abstract Page 2 lines 3-6**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an unattended validation/audit of printed e-media, i.e. e-mail messages, by a printer, as taught by Mitsuya into the invention of Wang, in order to provide verification to the transmitter that the message has reached the receiving individual and has printed successfully and also gaining the automated advantage of instant verification to the sender that the document has reached the receiver even if the receiver is not physically present.

Regarding claims 24-26, these are method claims which are similar to the methods claimed in claims 20-22. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 24-26 are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2143

13. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454) in view of Mitsuya (JP-411312068A).

Regarding claim 27, Wang teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for performing validation/audit of delivery of e-media, comprising the steps of:

Packaging, by the sender/user, the e-media and specifying the level of feedback [Wang -- Col. 6 lines 63-67 – E-mail, with/without an attachment, is composed along with or without certification request to provide validation, i.e. level of feedback];

Requesting, by the sender/user, the delivery service to deliver the e-media [Wang -- Col. 7 lines 1-2 – Sender transmits message to ISP and mail server to be delivered];

Accessing, by the delivery service, the sender/user account to obtain pertinent information [Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – Upon logging into server and requesting to send message, mail server software inherently accesses storage unit to get information from sender account, i.e. username, password, IP address, etc, before sending the message];

Transmitting, by the delivery service, the e-media to the client/receiving party [Wang -- Col. 7 lines 3-11 – ISP routes message to mail server of receiving client].

Wang, however, fails to teach an unattended validate/audit of delivery of media along with delivering and validating of the e-media by a consumption device, i.e. printer, of the client/receiving party.

Mitsuya teaches an unattended process wherein a printer, upon delivery of an e-mail message, validates the e-mail message after it is printed [Mitsuya -- Abstract Page 2 lines 3-6].

Art Unit: 2143

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an unattended validation/audit of printed e-media, i.e. e-mail messages, by a printer, as taught by Mitsuya into the invention of Wang, in order to provide verification to the transmitter that the message has reached the receiving individual and has printed successfully and also gaining the automated advantage of instant verification to the sender that the document has reached the receiver even if the receiver is not physically present.

Regarding claim 28, Wang-Mitsuya teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the pertinent information includes at least one of:

A user's encrypted/unencrypted Unique Identifier [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 26-27 -- Sender logs in to account in order to access functions on the server, i.e. send or receive messages**];
and

A desired level of delivery validation/audit feedback [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 5-7 -- The server determines whether or not user has requested the mail be sent certified, i.e. requires notification, or not**].

Regarding claim 29, Wang-Matsuya teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the step of validating, by the consumption device of the client/receiving party, the correct delivery of the e-media includes validating a user's encrypted/unencrypted Unique Identifier [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 51-55 -- Receiving party logs-on to accept and receive certified mail**].

Art Unit: 2143

14. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 6,314,454) in view of Mitsuya (JP-411312068A) and Stork et al. (U.S. 5,710,816).

Regarding claim 30, Wang teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for performing validation/audit of delivery of e-media, comprising the steps of:

Packaging, by the sender/user, the e-media and specifying the level of feedback [**Wang -- Col. 6 lines 63-67 – E-mail, with/without an attachment, is composed along with or without certification request to provide validation, i.e. level of feedback**];

Requesting, by the sender/user, the delivery service to deliver the e-media [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 1-2 – Sender transmits message to ISP and mail server to be delivered**];

Accessing, by the delivery service, the sender/user account to obtain pertinent information [**Wang -- Col. 4 lines 44-51 and Col. 7 lines 26-27 – Upon logging into server and requesting to send message, mail server software inherently accesses storage unit to get information from sender account, i.e. username, password, IP address, etc, before sending the message**];

Transmitting, by the delivery service, the e-media to the client/receiving party [**Wang -- Col. 7 lines 3-11 – ISP routes message to mail server of receiving client**].

Wang, however, fails to teach an unattended validate/audit of delivery of media along with delivering and validating of the e-media by a consumption device, i.e. printer, of the client/receiving party and where the receiving party specifies the level of feedback.

Mitsuya teaches an unattended process wherein a printer, upon delivery of an e-mail message, validates the e-mail message after it is printed [**Mitsuya -- Abstract Page 2 lines 3-6**].

Art Unit: 2143

Furthermore, Stork teaches the ability of a receiving client to specify and send a certification request to a sender of a message, i.e. e-mail or voice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an unattended validation/audit of printed e-media, i.e. e-mail messages, by a printer along with having the receiver specify and request a certification, as taught by Mitsuya and Stork into the invention of Wang, in order to increase security by allowing a receiving party to specify whether certification is wanted or not and to provide verification to the transmitter that the message has reached the receiving individual and has printed successfully and also gaining the automated advantage of instant verification to the sender that the document has reached the receiver even if the receiver is not physically present.

Regarding claims 31-32, these are system claims corresponding to the methods claimed in claims 28-29. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 31-32 are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- Flynn et al. (U.S. 6,618,747) discloses an electronic delivery and communication system that provides verification to sender of delivery.

- Johnson et al. (U.S. 5,832,220) discloses a method for a sender to request acknowledgement by a receiver upon receipt of an item.
- Zabetian (U.S. 6,327,656) discloses a system which provides for electronic document certification and verification by a sender and receiving unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


TJM
December 12, 2003


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100